

NON-SIMPLE SLE CURVES ARE NOT DETERMINED BY THEIR RANGE

JASON MILLER, SCOTT SHEFFIELD, AND WENDELIN WERNER

ABSTRACT. We show that when observing the range of a chordal SLE_κ curve for $\kappa \in (4, 8)$, it is not possible to recover the order in which the points have been visited. We also derive related results about conformal loop ensembles (CLE): (i) The loops in a CLE_κ for $\kappa \in (4, 8)$ are not determined by the CLE_κ gasket. (ii) The continuum percolation interfaces defined in the fractal carpets of conformal loop ensembles CLE_κ for $\kappa \in (8/3, 4)$ (we defined these percolation interfaces in [15], and showed there that they are $\text{SLE}_{16/\kappa}$ curves) are not determined by the CLE_κ carpet that they are defined in.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Schramm-Loewner evolutions (SLE) defined by Oded Schramm [19] in 1999 are the canonical conformally invariant, non-crossing, fractal curves which connect a pair of boundary points in a simply connected planar domain, and their importance has since been highlighted in numerous settings. The SLE family is indexed by the positive real parameter κ , and there are three different regimes of κ values which correspond to different sample path behavior of an SLE_κ curve [18]: it is a simple curve for $\kappa \in (0, 4]$, a self-intersecting but not space-filling curve for $\kappa \in (4, 8)$, and a space-filling curve for $\kappa \geq 8$.

In this work, we will answer the following question: Is it possible to recover the *trajectory* η of the SLE_κ (i.e. the map $t \mapsto \eta(t)$) when one observes its *range* (i.e. the set of points $\eta([0, \infty))$)? In other words, if one knows the *set* of points that an SLE_κ visited, can one recover the *order* in which they were traced? The answer in the regime where $\kappa \in (4, 8)$ is the following:

Theorem 1.1 (SLE $_\kappa$ range does not determine the path). *Fix $\kappa \in (4, 8)$, suppose that η is an SLE_κ process from 0 to ∞ in the upper half-plane, and consider some fixed $T \in (0, \infty]$. Then the trajectory $\eta|_{[0, T]}$ is almost surely not determined by its range $\eta([0, T])$. In fact, the conditional law of the trajectory given its range is almost surely non-atomic.*

We note that the answer to this question in the other regimes of κ values is trivial because for a simple curve one can also recover the trajectory given its range and one cannot for a space-filling curve.

In the proof of this result, we will view our SLE_κ path as living in an ambient space with many other SLE_κ paths around. More specifically, we will take here this space to be a collection of loops which come from a conformal loop ensemble CLE_κ [22, 25] with $\kappa \in (4, 8)$. This is in contrast to several other recent works, in which it was natural to use the Gaussian free field (GFF) as the structure in which the path is naturally embedded [23, 4, 12, 13, 14, 11].

We will also answer two natural questions about CLE. Recall that a CLE describes the distribution of a natural random collection of loops in a simply connected domain. The law of a CLE in a simply

connected domain is conformally invariant (and one can therefore always view it as the conformal image of a CLE defined in the unit disk) and it is described by the same parameter κ as SLE, but with the constraint that κ has to be in the interval $(8/3, 8)$. The loops of a CLE_κ are SLE_κ -type paths. Again, there are two ranges depending on whether or not $\kappa > 4$. When $\kappa \in (8/3, 4]$, the loops are simple, disjoint and do not touch the boundary of the domain they are defined in, whereas when $\kappa \in (4, 8)$, the loops are non-simple (but non-self-crossing) and can touch each other and the boundary.

Our first result about CLE will deal with the latter case (where $\kappa \in (4, 8)$). The set of points that is not surrounded by any of the loops (in the sense that the index of all the loops around those points is 0) is a random closed set called the CLE_κ gasket, and can be viewed as the natural conformally invariant random version of the Sierpinski gasket. Because the individual loops of the CLE_κ touch each other and the boundary, it is a priori not clear whether one can recover the individual loops by just looking at the gasket. Indeed, it is not possible:

Theorem 1.2 (CLE_κ gasket does not determine CLE_κ loops). *Fix $\kappa \in (4, 8)$ and suppose that Γ is the collection of loops in a (non-nested) CLE_κ . Then Γ is almost surely not determined by the CLE_κ gasket. In fact, the conditional law of Γ given its gasket is almost surely non-atomic.*

We now turn to our second result for CLE, which is focused on the case of CLE_κ for $\kappa \in (8/3, 4)$. Recall that in this case, the loops in the CLE_κ form a disjoint collection of simple loops that also do not touch the boundary, so that the set of points that are encircled by no loop (this set is now called the CLE_κ carpet) can be viewed as a natural conformally invariant random version of the Sierpinski carpet. In [15], we have defined and described natural continuous percolation interfaces (CPI) within such CLE_κ carpets, that can intuitively describe boundaries of critical percolation clusters within these random fractal sets. These interfaces turn out to be variants of $\text{SLE}_{16/\kappa}$ curves, that are coupled with the CLE_κ .

Theorem 1.3 (Continuous percolation within CLE_κ is random). *Fix $\kappa \in (8/3, 4)$, suppose that Γ is a CLE_κ , and that η is an $\text{SLE}_{16/\kappa}$ -type curve coupled with Γ as a CPI in the sense of [15]. Then the range of η (and therefore also the path) is almost surely not determined by Γ . In fact, the conditional law of η given Γ is almost surely non-atomic.*

In fact, this statement also holds in the case of the “labeled” CLE_κ for $\kappa \in (8/3, 4)$ which are described in [15], where for each of the CLE_κ loops, one tosses an independent biased coin to decide whether it is open or closed for the considered percolation process that one constructs. We note that the analog of Theorem 1.3 for the labeled CLE_4 is known to be false (see [15]): the continuous percolation interfaces in a labeled balanced (one uses a fair coin to choose the labels) CLE_4 are deterministic functions of the labeled CLE_4 itself.

Theorem 1.3 also sheds some light about the coupling between the GFF and the CLE_κ carpets when $\kappa \in (8/3, 4)$, as it shows that in these couplings, the GFF is not a deterministic function of the nested CLE_κ carpets.

The rough idea of the proof of Theorem 1.2 will be to construct a measure μ which is supported on a certain set of exceptional points. These points are either intersection points between two distinct macroscopic CLE loops, or double points on one single loop. In both cases, there are four different macroscopic strands that emanate from these points. We will then show that if one performs the Markov step of picking a point at random using μ , and then resamples the way that the four macroscopic strands are hooked up at that point, one roughly preserves the law of the global CLE.




FIGURE 1. Idea of the proof of Theorem 1.2: Choosing a pivotal and resampling its state can merge loops without changing the gasket.




FIGURE 2. Idea of the proof of Theorem 1.1: An SLE_κ path with $\kappa \in (4, 8)$ and two intertwined double points. The path depends on whether it visits the plain part before the dashed part or not, but the range does not. Choosing two such double points according to some well-chosen measure μ' and resampling the order between dashed and plain will preserve the range but not the path

During this resampling step, the gasket is preserved, but one can merge two loops into one or split one loop into two (see Figure 1). This shows that it is not possible to identify the individual loops by just observing the gasket.

The proofs of Theorem 1.3 and of Theorem 1.1 will follow a similar idea, except that in the latter case, one will need to construct a measure μ' on special *pairs* of intertwined double points on the path, and the Markov step will consist in switching simultaneously the hook-up configuration between the four strands at both points in order to preserve the range of the path (see Figure 2). This then leads to a coupling of a pair of SLE_κ paths which have the same range but visit their *common range* in a different order.

The construction and non-triviality of these measures μ and μ' is based on the multi-scale second moment method, which has also been used in many instances in the last decades to study the Hausdorff dimensions of random fractals.

2. PRELIMINARIES

We will now review some preliminary facts before proceeding to the proofs of our main theorems. In Section 2.1, we will explain a possible approach to proving our results when $\kappa = 6$ using properties of Bernoulli percolation. In Sections 2.2 and 2.3, we will give a brief review of the construction of CLE_κ and some results from [15]. We will assume that the reader of this work is familiar with the definition of SLE_κ [19] and with the so-called $\text{SLE}_\kappa(\rho)$ processes [9]. We direct the reader to [10, 28] for reviews of the former and to [15, 12] for more on the latter.

2.1. Percolation pivotal points analogy. Although it will not be used directly in our proofs, it is worthwhile to first describe a possible proof of Theorem 1.1 in the special case where $\kappa = 6$. Indeed, our proof will have some analogies with the strategy that we will now outline.

The SLE_6 curve is known to be the scaling limit of percolation interfaces and the way in which the discrete interface approaches the SLE_6 in the scaling limit is well-understood [26, 2, 29]. In particular, the double points of SLE_6 correspond to the scaling limit of the double points in the discrete percolation interface (see for instance [29]). These discrete double points form a subset of the set of points in the percolation configuration where a so-called four-arm event holds (two disjoint closed and two open arms touch these points in alternating circular order, and they create four percolation interface strands). Furthermore, thanks to the work of Garban, Pete and Schramm [6, 7], the way in which the counting measure on such double points approaches a natural measure on the set of double points of SLE_6 in the scaling limit is well-understood.

Suppose now that one considers a long percolation interface, and consider two given disjoint macroscopic domains (here the domains will be thought of as fixed, while the mesh of the lattice will tend to zero). With positive probability, it will happen that the percolation interfaces visits these two domains twice and create intertwined double points as in Figure 3. On this event, we can decide to choose at random a pair of such intertwined double points using the counting measure on such pairs, and to change the status of both of these two points simultaneously. Note that this will basically not change the range of the percolation interface, but only the order in which the three strands of the percolation interface that join the two double points are traced. This indicates that the probability of the obtained configuration is comparable to the probability of the initial one (before switching how the strands are hooked up), which in turn indicates that in the scaling limit, the SLE_6 curve cannot be a deterministic function of its range.

Let us note that in order to make the previous idea work, it is sufficient to use the counting measure on some “special” intertwined double points which satisfy some extra conditions. For instance, one can use points where the four strands are well-separated at some macroscopic scale. Such points are easier to work with when obtaining uniform estimates: In particular, when one conditions on the event that such a well-separated four-arm event occurs at two given points, then one can see that the conditional probability that these two points end up being intertwined on the percolation interface is bounded from below. Instead of sampling according to the counting measure along the curve, one can (up to constants in the probabilities) therefore first choose the two points at random in some uniform way in two prescribed domains, then sample the nice four-arm events in their respective macroscopic neighborhood, and then finally the percolation configuration in the remaining domains, in such a way that they hook up the arms so that the percolation interface visits these two points, and then finally the state of these two points.

Our approach to the general SLE_κ case will have a similar flavor, although we will work directly in the continuum. The percolation configuration will be replaced by a CLE_κ instance. We will




FIGURE 3. Choose two points in the dotted regions and condition on the independent nice four-arm events for both of them. Then, the conditional probability of the interface creating the intertwined double points as shown in the figure is bounded from below, and the order that the three strands are visited changes if one changes the way in which the strands are hooked up at those double points.

discover the CLE_κ first near the two points z, w using branches of the CLE_κ exploration tree. We will also define some “nice four-arm type events” and use the conformal Markov property of SLE_κ and CLE_κ to control the correlations between what happens in different regions.

2.2. CLE_κ background when $\kappa \in (4, 8)$. We will now give a very brief review of the construction and the main properties of CLE_κ for $\kappa \in (4, 8)$. These results follow fairly directly from [22] – see also [15] for a more extensive review. (Mind that some of the statements that we will survey here do *not* hold for $\kappa \in (8/3, 4]$.)

These collections of loops are the conjectural scaling limits of the collection of interfaces for a critical FK model for $q = 2 + 2\cos(8\pi/\kappa)$ with free boundary conditions on a planar lattice approximation of a simply connected domain. The special cases $\kappa = 6$ and $\kappa = 16/3$ have been shown to correspond respectively to the scaling limits of site percolation on the triangular lattice [26, 2] (as mentioned in the previous subsection) and of the critical Ising-FK model [27]. The works [24, 5] together imply that CLE_κ is the scaling limit (for the so-called peanosphere-topology) of the interfaces in the critical FK model for $q = 2 + \cos(8\pi/\kappa)$ on certain types of random planar map models. We will focus here only on the case of the “non-nested” CLE_κ where no two loops are nested: For a given point, there is at most one loop in the CLE_κ with non-zero index around that point. This corresponds to the conjectural scaling limit of the outermost interfaces in the FK-percolation models.

The CLE_κ exploration tree has been defined in [22], building on the target-invariance property of the $\text{SLE}_\kappa(\kappa - 6)$ process established in [3, 21]. For what follows, it will be sufficient to consider the “totally asymmetric” version of this branching tree which is defined as follows. Suppose that $D \subseteq \mathbf{C}$ is a non-trivial simply connected domain. One chooses a starting point (or root) on ∂D , and then couples $\text{SLE}_\kappa(\kappa - 6)$ processes from this point to all points in the domain, in such a way that any two of them (targeting y and y' , say) coincide up to the first time at which their trace disconnects y from y' . After y and y' are first separated, the processes then evolve conditionally independently. We note that this coupling exists precisely because of the target-invariance of these processes. Then,

using this tree, and guided by the conjectures about discrete models, it is explained in [22] how to define a collection of loops: For each given point z , the loop that surrounds z in the loop-ensemble is simply defined as the first clockwise loop that is traced around z by the branch of the exploration tree that targets z . This defines the CLE_κ , and gives rise to a number of natural conjectures about this object.

One property conjectured in [22] (this is very natural because this property holds in the case of discrete models) is that the law of this collection of loops does not depend on the choice of the root of the exploration tree. This property does not follow easily from the branching tree definition and setup, but it has now been established, using the reversibility of SLE_κ derived in [14]. It was also conjectured in [22] that these loops are in fact continuous curves. This follows from [12], where it is shown that the $\text{SLE}_\kappa(\rho)$ curves are continuous provided $\rho > -2$. The local finiteness of CLE_κ , i.e. that the number of loops with diameter at least ϵ is for each $\epsilon > 0$ almost surely finite, was established in [11] as a consequence of the almost sure continuity of the so-called space-filling SLE. (The corresponding statements for simple CLE's, i.e. CLE_κ for $\kappa \in (8/3, 4]$, were established in [25] using the connection with the so-called Brownian loop soups. Our paper [15] contains another derivation of these facts based on the coupling of SLE with the GFF.)

The CLE_κ is a deterministic function of the exploration tree. Conversely, as explained in [22], when $\kappa \in (4, 8)$, the exploration trees are in fact deterministic functions of the CLE_κ together with a marked boundary point which serves as the root of the tree. It makes it possible to discover simultaneously different portions of exploration trees starting from different points that are associated with a same CLE_κ . This idea will play a key role in the present paper.

Note that Theorem 1.3 of the present paper will show that in the case where $\kappa \in (8/3, 4)$, the CLE_κ exploration tree is *not* a deterministic function of the CLE_κ . For the special case $\kappa = 4$, see e.g. the discussion in [15] (the exploration defines a tree only for the balanced labeled CLE_4 , which together with the choice of the root, does determine the exploration tree – as can be shown using the direct relationship between this labeled CLE_4 and the GFF).

2.3. CLE_κ background when $\kappa \in (8/3, 4)$ and continuum percolation construction. Suppose that $\kappa \in (2, 4)$ and $\rho \in (-2, \kappa - 4)$. We first begin by reminding the reader of the construction of the so-called *boundary conformal loop ensembles* $\text{BCLE}_\kappa(\rho)$ defined in [15, Section 7]. This is a conformally invariant family of boundary-touching SLE_κ -type loops which live in a simply connected domain D and is defined as follows. Despite the fact that $\kappa < 4$, its definition does follow rather closely that of non-simple CLEs that we recalled in the previous subsection. As we will sometimes describe simultaneously some SLE processes for different values of κ , we will use in this subsection the notation $\kappa \in (2, 4)$ and $\kappa' = 16/\kappa \in (4, 8)$, as in [15].

We fix a point $x \in \partial D$. For each $y \in \partial D$ distinct from x , we let η_y be an $\text{SLE}_\kappa(\rho; \kappa - 6 - \rho)$ process starting from x and targeted at y . Note that the chosen range of ρ values is precisely so that ρ and $\kappa - 6 - \rho$ are both greater than -2 . By the target invariance of processes of this type [3, 21], we can couple together a family of such processes η_y which are targeted at a countable, dense subset of ∂D with the property that for y, z in this set, the processes η_y and η_z almost surely agree with each other until they first separate y from z , and after y and z are separated, the two processes evolve conditionally independently. The union of this collection of paths divides D into a countable collection of subdomains where the boundary of each such domain is cut out by a sequence of such paths. Each such subdomain boundary is naturally oriented by the paths which form its boundary. The family of subdomains whose boundaries are oriented clockwise are the loops of the $\text{BCLE}_\kappa(\rho)$ and the family of subdomains whose boundaries are oriented counterclockwise are referred to as the

false loops of the $\text{BCLE}_\kappa(\rho)$. If we want to emphasize that the loops have a clockwise orientation, we will use the notation $\text{BCLE}_\kappa^\circ(\rho)$. One similarly defines $\text{BCLE}_\kappa^\circ(\rho)$ using $\text{SLE}_\kappa(\kappa - 6 - \rho; \rho)$ in place of $\text{SLE}_\kappa(\rho; \kappa - 6 - \rho)$ and takes the loops (resp. false loops) to be the subdomains whose boundary has a counterclockwise (resp. clockwise) orientation. Although it is not obvious from the construction, as shown in [15, Proposition 7.1], it follows from the reversibility of the $\text{SLE}_\kappa(\rho_1; \rho_2)$ processes with $\rho_1, \rho_2 > -2$ established in [13] that the corresponding families of loops do not depend on the choice of root x .

For $\kappa' \in (4, 8)$ and $\rho' \in (\kappa'/2 - 4, \kappa'/2 - 2)$, the $\text{BCLE}_{\kappa'}^\circ(\rho')$ and $\text{BCLE}_{\kappa'}^\circ(\rho')$ are defined in an analogous way and it follows from the reversibility of $\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}(\rho'_1; \rho'_2)$ with $\rho'_1, \rho'_2 \geq \kappa'/2 - 4$ established in [14] that the resulting family of loops does not depend on the choice of root [15, Proposition 7.1]. Recall that $\kappa'/2 - 2$ is the threshold below which the $\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}(\rho')$ processes are boundary intersecting. The range of ρ' values considered in the definition of $\text{BCLE}_{\kappa'}^\circ(\rho')$ is precisely so that $\rho' < \kappa'/2 - 2$ and $\kappa' - 6 - \rho' < \kappa'/2 - 2$ so that the loops do in fact hit the domain boundary. Note that $\text{BCLE}_{\kappa'}^\circ(0)$ is simply the collection of loops in a $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$ which intersect the boundary.

As explained in [15, Section 7.2], one can iterate BCLEs, alternating between κ and κ' loops in order to produce natural couplings of CLE_κ and $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$. The construction proceeds as follows.

- Sample a $\text{BCLE}_{\kappa'}^\circ(0)$ process Γ' . Sampling these loops is the continuum analog of exploring the boundary-touching FK clusters with free boundary conditions.
- Given Γ' , we then sample independent $\text{BCLE}_\kappa^\circ(-\kappa/2)$ processes in each of the (clockwise) loops of Γ' . Call the resulting collection of loops Γ . Sampling these loops is the continuum analog of exploring the boundary touching interfaces in the corresponding Potts model with free boundary conditions.
- Iterate the exploration in the false loops of Γ' and Γ .

It is shown in [15, Theorems 7.2 and 7.3] that the law of the κ -loops thus defined is in fact a CLE_κ . The proof uses the SLE commutation relations which are encoded by the GFF [12, 11].

We can use this construction to explore jointly the CLE_κ and $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$ loops together when coupled as above. Namely, [15, Theorem 7.3] implies that the law of the process which follows the CLE_κ loops in chronological order as they are visited by a branch of the $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$ exploration tree is that of an $\text{SLE}_\kappa(\kappa - 6)$ process. Moreover, the conditional law of the CLE_κ in the unexplored is given by independent instances of CLE_κ .

We refer to a branch of the $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$ exploration tree as a *continuum percolation exploration* (CPI) inside of the CLE_κ gasket because the aforementioned property characterizes the law of the coupling of the exploration tree branch with the CLE_κ (see [15, Definition 2.1] as well as [15, Section 4]). In the particular $\text{BCLE}_{\kappa'}/\text{BCLE}_\kappa$ iteration scheme described just above, the BCLE_κ loops are always attached to the right side of the $\text{BCLE}_{\kappa'}$ loops. This means that the CPI always reflects to the left whenever it hits a CLE_κ loop. This construction can however be generalized to the setting in which each of the CLE_κ holes is labeled either $+$ or $-$ independently with a given probability $p \in (0, 1)$. Then, the CPI reflects to the left (resp. right) when it hits a loop with a $+$ (resp. $-$) label. In this case the CPI is a branch in a $\text{BCLE}_{\kappa'}(\rho')$ exploration tree where ρ' is a function of p .

This more general coupling is related to a continuum version of the random cluster representation of the Potts model (see, e.g., [8] for a review) developed in [15]. See also [1] for the case of the Ising model.

3. CONFORMAL INVARIANCE OF CLE_κ EXPLORATION TREE HOOKUP PROBABILITIES

The goal of the present section will be to derive a conformal invariance statement related to pairs of explorations of CLE_κ 's. In Section 3.1, we will address the case that $\kappa \in (4, 8)$, which is the one that will be an essential ingredient in the proofs of our main three theorems. For completeness and future reference, we also discuss the case that $\kappa \in (8/3, 4]$ in Section 3.2 (note that the story in the case that $\kappa = 4$ is anyway much simpler because of the connection between the GFF and $\text{SLE}_4(\rho)$ processes).




FIGURE 4. Exploration of a CLE_κ for $\kappa \in (4, 8)$ starting from $-i$ and from i , creating four branches.

3.1. The case $\kappa \in (4, 8)$. Let us consider a CLE_κ for $\kappa \in (4, 8)$ in $\mathbf{D}$. Some of the CLE loops will hit $\partial\mathbf{D}$, and some others will not. For each loop $\mathcal{L}$ that intersects the counterclockwise half-circle from $-i$ to i , we can define its first and last intersection points $z(\mathcal{L})$ and $\tilde{z}(\mathcal{L})$ on this half-circle, when one moves from $-i$ to i . One can then define a continuous path $\eta_1^\#$ from $-i$ to i as follows: One moves counterclockwise along the half-circle, and each time one hits $z(\mathcal{L})$ for some loop $\mathcal{L}$, one attaches the clockwise loop $\mathcal{L}$ to the path, and then proceeds. We note that this defines a continuous path by the local finiteness of CLE_κ proved in [11]. One can then define the subpath η_1 of this path that corresponds to its growth as seen from i (loosely speaking, one cuts out all parts that are growing while hidden away from i). This path η_1 is the concatenation of all clockwise portions of loops $\mathcal{L}$ from $z(\mathcal{L})$ to $\tilde{z}(\mathcal{L})$ that are not disconnected from i and $-i$ by any other such portion. The law of the path η_1 is that of an $\text{SLE}_\kappa(\kappa - 6)$ from $-i$ to i in $\mathbf{D}$. In fact, η_1 is exactly the branch from $-i$ to i of the CLE_κ exploration tree.

One can note that after some time t (t can be a deterministic time or a stopping time with respect to the filtration generated by η_1), one can define $z(t)$ to be the last point on the half-circle from $-i$ to i that η_1 visited before t . If $\eta_1(t) \neq z(t)$, then this point $z(t)$ is (by construction) equal to $z(\mathcal{L})$ where $\mathcal{L}$ is the loop that η_1 is (partially) tracing at time t .

One can also interchange the roles of i and $-i$ and perform the backward procedure: one moves clockwise along the half-circle from i to $-i$, and attaches the loops of the CLE_κ drawn in counterclockwise manner. In this way, one defines a path $\eta_2^\#$ and a subpath η_2 (which is $\eta_2^\#$ seen as growing

from $-i$). While the time-reversal of $\eta_1^\#$ is not identical to $\eta_2^\#$ because the order of the loops and the way in which they are discovered have been changed, the time-reversal of η_1 is exactly η_2 (it is described also via the concatenation of the same portions of loops $\mathcal{L}$ between $\tilde{z}(\mathcal{L})$ and $z(\mathcal{L})$): The time-reversal of the $\text{SLE}_\kappa(\kappa - 6)$ η_1 from $-i$ to i is the $\text{SLE}_\kappa(\kappa - 6)$ η_2 from i to $-i$ (modulo the convention that the marked point is now on the other side of the path).

Let us now suppose that one has discovered η_1 up to a stopping time t and that $\eta_1(t) \neq z(t)$. As we have already mentioned, the point $z(t)$ is then the starting point of the CLE loop $\mathcal{L}$ that $\eta_1(t)$ is part of. In particular, the conditional law of the rest of this loop given $\eta_1|_{[0,t]}$ is exactly an SLE_κ from $\eta_1(t)$ to $z(t)$ in the component of $\mathbf{D} \setminus \eta_1([0,t])$ with $z(t)$ on its boundary. We can now decide to discover part of this loop counterclockwise starting from $z(t)$. By time-reversal of SLE_κ [14], the law of this path is an SLE_κ from $z(t)$ to $\eta_1(t)$ in the component of $\mathbf{D} \setminus \eta_1([0,t])$ with $\eta_1(t)$ on its boundary. Let us call this path $\tilde{\eta}_1$, and discover $\tilde{\eta}_1$ up to some stopping time s (note that the definition of $\tilde{\eta}_1$ and the notion of stopping time depend on $\eta_1|_{[0,t]}$). Given η_1 up to time t and $\tilde{\eta}_1$ up to time s , the law of the missing part of $\mathcal{L}$ joining $\eta_1(t)$ to $\tilde{\eta}_1(s)$ is just an SLE_κ in the remaining to be discovered domain (i.e. in the connected component $D_{t,s}$ of $\mathbf{D} \setminus (\eta_1([0,t]) \cup \tilde{\eta}_1([0,s]))$ which has $\tilde{\eta}_1(s)$ and $\eta_1(t)$ on its boundary). Indeed, this follows from the reversibility of SLE.

We now define symmetrically the path η_2 up to some stopping time t_2 , the point $\tilde{z}(t_2)$ and the path $\tilde{\eta}_2$ from $\tilde{z}(t_2)$ to $\eta_2(t_2)$. We assume that we are in a configuration as depicted in Figure 4, where all four points $\eta_1(t)$, $\tilde{\eta}_1(s)$, $\eta_2(t_2)$ and $\tilde{\eta}_2(s_2)$ are four different boundary points of the same connected component $D(t, s, t_2, s_2)$ of the remaining to be discovered domain. Typical examples of stopping times t , s , t_2 and s_2 can be the respective hitting times of a circle of radius r around the origin by the respective four strands (if they do make it to that circle).

We can note that conditionally on these four branches, two possibilities arise:

- $\eta_1(t)$ and $\eta_2(t_2)$ correspond to parts of the same CLE loop. In this case, $\tilde{\eta}_1$ will hook up with $\tilde{\eta}_2$, while the path η_1 will first hook up with η_2 (and these last two paths respectively coincide with $\eta_1^\#$ and $\eta_2^\#$ up to when they hook up). We call this the one-loop event E_1 .
- $\eta_1(t)$ and $\eta_2(t_2)$ correspond to different CLE loops. In this case, $\tilde{\eta}_1$ will hook up with $\eta_1^\#$ without meeting $\tilde{\eta}_2(s_2)$, and $\tilde{\eta}_2$ will hook up with $\eta_2^\#$ without meeting $\tilde{\eta}_1(s)$. We call this the two-loop event E_2 .

With the previous notation, we define $C(t, s, t_2, s_2)$ to be the configuration given by the domain $D(t, s, t_2, s_2)$ and the four counterclockwise ordered boundary points $\eta_1(t)$, $\tilde{\eta}_1(s)$, $\tilde{\eta}_2(s_2)$, $\eta_2(t_2)$. We are going to establish the following conformal invariance statement.

Lemma 3.1. *If we are in a configuration as depicted in Figure 4, the conditional distribution of the remaining pieces of η_1 , $\tilde{\eta}_1$, η_2 and $\tilde{\eta}_2$ in $D(t, s, t_2, s_2)$ until they hook up into one or two loops is a conformally invariant function of the configuration $C(t, s, t_2, s_2)$.*

In fact, in order to prove this lemma it suffices to prove the following seemingly weaker result:

Lemma 3.2. *If we are in a configuration as depicted in Figure 4, the conditional distribution of E_1 (and therefore of E_2) is a function $f_\kappa(\cdot)$ of the cross-ratio between the four boundary points in the configuration $C(t, s, t_2, s_2)$.*

Indeed, conditionally on E_1 , we can describe the joint conditional law of the remaining pieces of the loops containing η_1 and $\tilde{\eta}_1$ (and therefore of η_2 and $\tilde{\eta}_2$) in $D(t, s, t_2, s_2)$ as the bi-chordal SLE_κ joining the four end-points in that domain, which is characterized uniquely by the fact that

conditionally on one of the two paths, the law of the other one is an ordinary SLE_κ in the remaining domain (see [13, Theorem 4.1]), and we know that this property is satisfied in the present case (the same argument can also be applied when one conditions on E_2).

In fact, we can notice that this conditional distribution is in fact symmetric when one formally interchanges the roles of $(\eta_1(t), \tilde{\eta}_1(s), \tilde{\eta}_2(s_2), \eta_2(t_2))$ and $(\tilde{\eta}_2(s_2), \eta_2(t_2), \eta_1(t), \tilde{\eta}_1(s))$. It therefore follows that it is in fact sufficient to prove Lemma 3.2 in the case where we do not let grow $\tilde{\eta}_1$ or $\tilde{\eta}_2$ after η_1 and η_2 have been defined (in other words, when $s_2 = t_2 = 0$). Indeed, we can then decide to switch the roles of η_1, η_2 and $\tilde{\eta}_1, \tilde{\eta}_2$, and to continue growing η_1 and η_2 instead of growing $\tilde{\eta}_1$ and $\tilde{\eta}_2$, and by conformal invariance, the general case of Lemma 3.2 follows.

As we have already pointed out, η_1 (and its time-reversal η_2) is an $\text{SLE}_\kappa(\kappa - 6)$ process, so that the following result implies Lemma 3.2 (here, modulo conformal invariance, η plays the role of the remaining part of η_1 , including η_2 , while η_2 plays the role of the beginning of the time-reversal of η).

Lemma 3.3. *Fix $\kappa \in (4, 8)$ and suppose that η is an $\text{SLE}_\kappa(\kappa - 6)$ process in $\mathbf{H}$ from 0 to ∞ with force point located in $\mathbf{R}_+$. Let η_R be the time-reversal of η , let τ_R be an η_R -stopping time, and let D_{τ_R} be the component of $\mathbf{H} \setminus \eta_R([0, \tau_R])$ with 0 on its boundary. Then the conditional law of η given $\eta_R|_{[0, \tau_R]}$ viewed as a path in D_{τ_R} is a conformally invariant function of the configuration consisting of the domain D_{τ_R} and the four marked boundary points given by 0, the location of the force point, $\eta_R(\tau_R)$, and $\min(\eta_R|_{[0, \tau_R]} \cap \mathbf{R}_+)$.*

Proof of Lemma 3.3. Note that the case $\kappa = 6$ is trivial. We will treat the two cases $\kappa \in (6, 8)$ and $\kappa \in (4, 6)$ separately. The distinction between these two cases reflects the change in sign of $\kappa - 6$. When $\kappa \in (6, 8)$, we will use the SLE/GFF coupling [12] and the reversibility of SLE_κ [14]. When $\kappa \in (4, 6)$ we will use the CLE setup and results from [15] as reviewed just above in Section 2.3.

The proof in both cases will make use of a variant of the resampling characterization of *bi-chordal* SLE. More precisely, we will use a slightly more general version of [13, Theorem 4.1] that states that there is a unique law on pairs of curves (η_1, η_2) connecting a pair of boundary points x, y with η_1 to the left of η_2 so that the conditional law of η_1 given η_2 (resp. η_2 given η_1) is that of a certain $\text{SLE}_\kappa(\rho)$ type process with force points on its left (resp. right) side (the exact statement of [13, Theorem 4.1] can be very easily generalized to cover the cases that we need here, the proof works as soon as one considers paths such that the corresponding conditional laws can be realized in the SLE/GFF coupling. We will explain this in both of the settings below in which we will make use of it).

We choose again the following notation: we fix $\kappa' \in (4, 8)$ and let $\kappa = 16/\kappa' \in (2, 4)$. We first consider the case that $\kappa' \in (6, 8)$; see Figure 5 for an illustration of the argument. (The reader may find it helpful to look at [17, Figure 2.5].) We can view η' as the counterflow line from ∞ to 0 of a GFF h on $\mathbf{H}$ with constant boundary conditions given by $-\lambda' + \pi\chi$ on $\mathbf{R}$. Let η be the flow line of h with angle $\theta = 3\pi/2 - 2\lambda/\chi$ from 0 to ∞ . Then η is an $\text{SLE}_\kappa(3\kappa/2 - 4; 2 - 3\kappa/2)$ process. (Note that $2 - 3\kappa/2 > -2$ provided $\kappa < 8/3$ and $\kappa' > 6$.) Let η'_R be the time-reversal of η' and let τ, τ_R be stopping times for η', η'_R , respectively. Then:

- It follows from [12] that the conditional law of η given η' is independently that of an $\text{SLE}_\kappa(\kappa - 4; 2 - 3\kappa/2)$ process in each of the components of $\mathbf{H} \setminus \eta'$ which are to the right of η' and whose boundary have non-empty intersection with $\partial\mathbf{H}$ and
- The conditional law of η' given η is that of an $\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}$ process in the component of $\mathbf{H} \setminus \eta$ which is to the left of η . Consequently, by the reversibility of $\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}$ processes for $\kappa' \in (4, 8)$




FIGURE 5. Illustration of the setup used in the proof of Lemma 3.3 in the case that $\kappa' \in (6, 8)$. The red paths show an $\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}(\kappa' - 6)$ path η' and its time-reversal η'_R from $-i$ to i in $\mathbf{D}$ coupled with a GFF instance as a counterflow line drawn up to forward and reverse stopping times, τ and τ_R . The blue path is the remainder of η' . Shown in green is the flow line η of this GFF from $-i$ to i with angle $\theta = 3\pi/2 - 2\lambda/\chi$. It follows from [12] that the conditional law of η' given η is that of an $\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}$ process in the component of $\mathbf{D} \setminus \eta$ which is to the left of η . By the reversibility of $\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}$ proved in [12], the conditional law of η' given $\eta'|_{[0, \tau]}$, $\eta'_R|_{[0, \tau_R]}$, and η is that of an $\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}$ process in the remaining domain. Conversely, the conditional law of η given all of η' is independently that of an $\text{SLE}_{\kappa}(\kappa - 4; 2 - 3\kappa/2)$ in the components which are to the right of η' . Thus as these conditional laws are conformally invariant, the conformal invariance of the joint law of η' and η given $\eta'|_{[0, \tau]}$ and $\eta'_R|_{[0, \tau_R]}$ follows from the bi-chordal arguments of [13, Section 4].

proved in [14], it follows that the conditional law of η' given η , $\eta'|_{[0, \tau]}$, and $\eta'_R|_{[0, \tau_R]}$ is that of an $\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}$ process in the remaining domain.

Since the two conditional laws are conformally invariant given $\eta'|_{[0, \tau]}$ and $\eta'_R|_{[0, \tau_R]}$, it follows from the bi-chordal SLE characterization that the joint law of η and η' given $\eta'|_{[0, \tau]}$ and $\eta'_R|_{[0, \tau_R]}$ is conformally invariant. We note that the bi-chordal characterization that we use here differs slightly from [13, Theorem 4.1] because here we are considering a pair of paths, one of which is an $\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}$ type path, and the other is an SLE_{κ} path traveling in the opposite direction (while [13, Theorem 4.1] is stated in the case of two SLE_{κ} type paths). However, one can reduce our case to this setting by considering the pair of paths consisting of the right boundary of η' together with η and use that the conditional law of η' given its right boundary is that of an $\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}(\kappa'/2 - 4)$ process [12].

We next consider the case that $\kappa' \in (4, 6)$; see Figure 6 for an illustration of the argument. We let η' be an $\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}(\kappa' - 6)$ process in $\mathbf{H}$ from 0 to ∞ . Let η'_R be the time-reversal of η' and let τ (resp. τ_R) be a stopping time for η' (resp. η'_R). We view η' as a CPI (in the sense of [15, Definition 2.1]) coupled with a CLE_{κ} , say Γ , in $\mathbf{H}$. We note that then η'_R is also a CPI coupled with Γ . The CPI property of η'_R implies that $\eta'_R|_{[\tau_R, \infty)}$ is a CPI associated with the CLE_{κ} given by including those loops of Γ which are contained in the complementary component of $\eta'_R([0, \tau_R])$ with 0 on its boundary. In




FIGURE 6. Illustration of the setup used in the proof of Lemma 3.3 in the case that $\kappa' \in (4, 6)$. Shown is an $\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}(\kappa' - 6)$ process from $-i$ to i in $\mathbf{D}$ viewed as a CPI in a CLE_{κ} , $\kappa = 16/\kappa' \in (8/3, 4)$, process Γ . If we condition on η' up to a stopping time τ , the time-reversal η'_R of η' up to an η'_R -stopping time τ_R and the loops of Γ which touch this path segment (green loops), then the conditional law of the rest of η' (blue path) is an $\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}(\kappa' - 6)$ in the remaining domain. Conversely, if we condition on all of η' (red and blue paths), then the conditional law of the loops which touch η' is given by independent $\text{BCLE}_{\kappa}^{\circ}(-\kappa/2)$'s in the components of $\mathbf{D} \setminus \eta'$ which are surrounded by the right side of η' . Thus as these conditional laws are conformally invariant, the conformal invariance of the joint law follows from the bi-chordal arguments of [13, Section 4].

particular, conditioned on this we have that the law of the remainder of η' given $\eta|_{[0, \tau]}$ and $\eta'_R|_{[0, \tau_R]}$ and the loops of Γ which hit $\eta'_R|_{[0, \tau_R]}$ is that of an $\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}(\kappa' - 6)$ in the remaining domain.

Summarizing, we have that:

- Given $\eta'|_{[0, \tau]}$, $\eta'_R|_{[0, \tau_R]}$, and the loops of Γ which hit $\eta'_R|_{[0, \tau_R]}$, the remainder of η' has the law of an $\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}(\kappa' - 6)$ process in the remaining domain.
- Given all of η' , the conditional law of the loops of Γ which hit η' is given by a $\text{BCLE}_{\kappa}^{\circ}(-\kappa/2)$ in the complementary domain.

Since these two conditional laws are conformally invariant, it follows from the bi-chordal characterization that the joint law of η' and the aforementioned loops of Γ conformally invariant given $\eta'|_{[0, \tau]}$ and $\eta'_R|_{[0, \tau_R]}$ in the remaining domain. In particular, the law of the remaining segment of η' is conformally invariant given $\eta'|_{[0, \tau]}$ and $\eta'_R|_{[0, \tau_R]}$ in the remaining domain. Again, we stress that the bi-chordal characterization that we use here differs slightly from the one stated in [13, Theorem 4.1] because here we are considering a pair which consists of an $\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}$ type path and a collection of $\text{BCLE}_{\kappa}^{\circ}(-\kappa/2)$ loops. However, by considering the right boundary of η' , we can reduce to the setting of SLE_{κ} type paths. $\square$

As explained in [16], building on this lemma, on Dubédat's commutation relations [3] and some SLE estimates, it is actually possible to explicitly identify the hook-up probability function f_{κ}

in terms of a ratio of hypergeometric functions. We conclude this subsection with the following simpler result that just states that the function f_κ is well-behaved (this will be sufficient for the purpose of the present paper). Here and in the sequel, we refer to the definition of the cross-ratio of a conformal rectangle to be defined on $(0, \infty)$ and equal to 1 for a conformal square such as the unit disk with the four boundary points $1, i, -1, -i$:

Lemma 3.4. *The function $f_\kappa(\cdot)$ is bounded away from 0 and from 1 on any compact subset of $(0, \infty)$.*

Proof. It for instance suffices to start from the configuration $C(t, s, t_2, s_2)$ with cross-ratio c and to note that it is possible (with positive probability $p_\kappa(c)$) to let η_1 grow further until the new cross-ratio hits 1. Hence, we get that $f_\kappa(c) \geq p_\kappa(c)f_\kappa(1)$. The same argument can be applied to the two-loop event. $\square$

3.2. The case $\kappa \in (8/3, 4]$. We are now going to establish analogs of Lemma 3.3 for the case $\kappa \in (8/3, 4]$. The statements will take a slightly different form than in the case of Lemma 3.3 because the branches of the exploration tree used to build a CLE_κ are not deterministic functions of the CLE_κ anymore (indeed, this is one of the main results of the present paper). As mentioned at the beginning of this section, the content of the present subsection will not be used later on in the present work and we have only included it here for future reference; it is, in fact, used in [16].

Recall (see [15] and the references therein for background on these $\text{SLE}_\kappa(\rho)$ processes when $\rho \leq -2$) that when $\kappa \in (8/3, 4)$, for each choice of $\beta \in [-1, 1]$, one can define an $\text{SLE}_\kappa^\beta(\kappa - 6)$ process where, loosely speaking, $p = (1 + \beta)/2$ represents the probability that when this process traces a loop, it does trace it clockwise (and the trunk then passes to the right of that loop, while when this process traces a loop counterclockwise, its trunk passes to the left of that loop). When $\kappa = 4$, one has to use a symmetric side-swapping (i.e., $\beta = 0$ in the previous setup), but there is a drift-type parameter μ that one can play with and that leads to the so-called $\text{SLE}_4^{0, \mu}$ processes. All these processes are conformally invariant “explorations” of the CLE that they do construct.

Let us first suppose that $\kappa \in (8/3, 4)$ and suppose that Γ is a CLE_κ in a domain D and let $x \neq y$ denote two boundary points. For simplicity, in the following lemma, η (resp. $\tilde{\eta}$) will denote conditionally independent (given Γ) $\text{SLE}_\kappa(\kappa - 6)$ explorations of Γ starting from x (resp. y) and targeted at y (resp. x), such that all of the loops of η (resp. $\tilde{\eta}$) are on the right (resp. left) side of its trunk. In the $\text{SLE}_\kappa^\beta(\kappa - 6)$ notation, this means that $\beta = 1$ for one of the explorations and is -1 for the other one. Recall that such explorations do not exist for $\kappa = 4$ (there, the side-swapping is necessary), which is why we excluded $\kappa = 4$ in this first statement.

Lemma 3.5. *Let Γ , η and $\tilde{\eta}$ be defined as just described. Suppose that τ (resp. $\tilde{\tau}$) is a stopping time for η (resp. $\tilde{\eta}$). On the event that $\eta|_{[0, \tau]}$ is disjoint from $\tilde{\eta}|_{[0, \tilde{\tau}]}$, the conditional law of the remaining to be discovered CLE is a conformally invariant function of the remaining domain and the four marked points which correspond to $\eta(\tau)$, $\tilde{\eta}(\tilde{\tau})$, the most recent point that η has hit on its trunk before τ , and the most recent point that $\tilde{\eta}$ has visited on its trunk before $\tilde{\tau}$.*

Proof. Let η' (resp. $\tilde{\eta}'$) be the trunk of η (resp. $\tilde{\eta}$). Then η' and $\tilde{\eta}'$ are both $\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}(\kappa' - 6)$ processes. Let σ (resp. $\tilde{\sigma}$) be the first time after τ (resp. $\tilde{\tau}$) that η (resp. $\tilde{\eta}$) completes the loop of Γ that it is drawing at time τ (resp. $\tilde{\tau}$). Depending on how these partially drawn loops of Γ hook up, we emphasize that the path segments $\eta|_{[\tau, \sigma]}$ and $\tilde{\eta}|_{[\tilde{\tau}, \tilde{\sigma}]}$ may belong either to the same or to different loops of Γ . Let τ' (resp. $\tilde{\tau}'$) be such that $\eta'(\tau')$ (resp. $\tilde{\eta}'(\tilde{\tau}')$) is equal to the location of the force

point for η (resp. $\tilde{\eta}$) at time τ (resp. $\tilde{\tau}$). In other words, $\eta'(\tau')$ (resp. $\tilde{\eta}'(\tilde{\tau}')$) is the point on the trunk of η (resp. $\tilde{\eta}$) which it most recently visited before time τ (resp. $\tilde{\tau}$).

We consider the conditional law of η' between time τ' and the first time it first hits $\tilde{\eta}'([0, \tilde{\tau}'])$, which we call σ' . From the trunk construction of $\text{SLE}_\kappa(\kappa - 6)$ as reviewed above, we know that the conditional law of η' between these two times given $\eta|_{[0, \sigma]}$ and $\tilde{\eta}|_{[0, \tilde{\sigma}]}$ (which may or may not be disjoint) is that of an $\text{SLE}_{\kappa'}(\kappa' - 6)$ process in the remaining domain. Indeed, this follows because the conditional law of Γ given $\eta|_{[0, \sigma]}$ and $\tilde{\eta}|_{[0, \tilde{\sigma}]}$ is given by that of an independent CLE_κ in the components of $D \setminus (\eta([0, \sigma]) \cup \tilde{\eta}([0, \tilde{\sigma}]))$ which are not surrounded by a loop of Γ . We note that there is one such component if $\eta([0, \sigma])$ and $\tilde{\eta}([0, \tilde{\sigma}])$ are disjoint and there are two such components otherwise.

Consider the path γ which starts from $\eta(\tau)$ and explores the loops of Γ , viewed as a path in the component of $D \setminus (\eta([0, \tau]) \cup \tilde{\eta}([0, \tilde{\tau}]) \cup \eta'([0, \sigma']))$ with $\eta(\tau)$ on its boundary. If $\eta(\tau)$ and $\tilde{\eta}(\tilde{\tau})$ are on the boundaries of distinct components, then we view γ as a path which is targeted at the last point on the boundary which is visited by η' . If $\eta(\tau)$ and $\tilde{\eta}(\tilde{\tau})$ are on the boundary of the same component, then we view γ as a path targeted at $\tilde{\eta}(\tilde{\tau})$. By the same reasoning as above, the conditional law of γ given $\eta|_{[0, \tau]}$, $\tilde{\eta}|_{[0, \tilde{\tau}]}$, and $\eta'|_{[0, \sigma']}$ is that of an $\text{SLE}_\kappa(3\kappa/2 - 6)$ in the case that $\eta(\tau)$ and $\tilde{\eta}(\tilde{\tau})$ are on the boundary of different components. In the case that they are in the same complementary component, the conditional law of γ is given by that of an $\text{SLE}_\kappa(3\kappa/2 - 6)$ process given part of its beginning and end. (Note that $3\kappa/2 - 6 = (\kappa - 6) - (-\kappa/2)$, so this comes from the trunk construction of $\text{SLE}_\kappa(\kappa - 6)$.) In the former situation, the conditional law is clearly conformally invariant. The same is true in the latter situation as it was proved in [13] that the law of such curves are conformally invariant function of their domain and their four marked points. The bi-chordal arguments of [13, Section 4] then imply that the joint law of γ and $\eta'|_{[\tau', \sigma']}$ given $\eta|_{[0, \tau]}$ and $\tilde{\eta}|_{[0, \tilde{\tau}]}$ is conformally invariant. The proof is thus complete because it is easy to see that the conditional law of the remainder of Γ given $\eta|_{[0, \tau]}$, $\tilde{\eta}|_{[0, \tilde{\tau}]}$, $\eta'|_{[\tau', \sigma']}$, and γ is conformally invariant. $\square$

The previous proof requires just a couple of adjustments in order to treat the case where the explorations η and $\tilde{\eta}$ are side-swapping. The first modification is that one has to restrict the conditioning to those events where at τ and $\tilde{\tau}$, η and $\tilde{\eta}$ are exploring loops in different orientations (clockwise vs. counterclockwise) – this ensures that the two loops lie on the same side of the trunk. Then, the only other modification is that the conditional laws of the curves given the trunk will be $\text{SLE}_\kappa(\rho)$'s for new values of ρ (see [15]). This allows us to generalize Lemma 3.6 (this now includes the case $\kappa = 4$).

In the following statement, Γ is now a CLE_κ for $\kappa \in (8/3, 4]$. When $\kappa < 4$, then for some $\beta \in [-1, 1]$, η (resp. $\tilde{\eta}$) denotes a side-swapping $\text{SLE}_\kappa^\beta(\kappa - 6)$ exploration (resp. a $\text{SLE}_\kappa^{-\beta}(\kappa - 6)$ exploration) coupled with Γ , starting from the boundary point x (resp. y) targeting the boundary point y (resp. x). When $\kappa = 4$, then for some real μ , η (resp. $\tilde{\eta}$) denotes a side-swapping $\text{SLE}_4^{0, \mu}(-2)$ exploration (resp. a $\text{SLE}_4^{0, -\mu}(-2)$ exploration) coupled with Γ , starting from the boundary point x (resp. y) targeting the boundary point y (resp. x). In all cases, we assume furthermore that given Γ , the two explorations η and $\tilde{\eta}$ are conditionally independent.

Lemma 3.6. *Suppose that τ (resp. $\tilde{\tau}$) is a stopping time for η (resp. $\tilde{\eta}$). On the event that $\eta|_{[0, \tau]}$ is disjoint from $\tilde{\eta}|_{[0, \tilde{\tau}]}$ and that at times τ and $\tilde{\tau}$ the loop-exploration directions (clockwise/counterclockwise) of η and $\tilde{\eta}$ are different, the conditional law of the remaining to be discovered CLE is a conformally invariant function of the remaining domain and the four marked points which correspond to $\eta(\tau)$, $\tilde{\eta}(\tilde{\tau})$, the most recent point that η has hit on its trunk before τ , and the most recent point that $\tilde{\eta}$ has visited on its trunk before $\tilde{\tau}$.*

Just as in the case $\kappa \in (4, 8)$, the CLE hook-up probabilities for $\kappa \in (8/3, 4]$ can also be worked out, building among other things on the present Lemma 3.6, on commutation relation considerations and on some SLE estimates, see [16]. The results in [16] in fact implies that the conformally invariant conditional distributions described in Lemma 3.6 do depend solely on κ and not on the choice of β (or μ when $\kappa = 4$).

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

This section is devoted to the proof of the fact that the CLE_κ loops are not determined by the CLE_κ gasket when $\kappa \in (4, 8)$. We will explain in the subsequent section what modifications in the argument of the proof of this result enable us to also establish Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.3.

Throughout this section, $\kappa \in (4, 8)$ is fixed and all constants that will appear in the proofs can depend on our choice of κ .

4.1. Notation. When $\underline{z} = (z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4)$ is a quadruple of counterclockwise ordered points on the unit circle, we denote by $\mathbf{P}_{\underline{z}}$ the joint law of the configuration with the four strands $\eta_1, \tilde{\eta}_1, \tilde{\eta}_2$ and η_2 that were described in the previous section, starting respectively from these four points. More precisely, this is the conformal image of the law described in Lemma 3.1.

From now on, we will actually denote these paths by $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3$ and γ_4 , and we will also use the notation $\underline{\gamma} = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3, \gamma_4)$. We note that γ_1 (resp. γ_3) hooks up with either γ_2 or γ_4 (and then ends at z_2 or z_4) but does not hook up with γ_3 (resp. γ_1). To prove Theorem 1.2, we will first show that, on the positive probability event that γ_1 and γ_3 intersect each other, it is not possible to determine whether γ_1 terminates at z_2 or z_4 when one just observes the union of the *ranges* of γ_1 and γ_3 .

We let $\underline{o} = (o_1, \dots, o_4) = (-i, 1, i, -1)$ and define $\mathcal{T}$ to be the collection all 4-tuples $\underline{z}$ where for each j , $|z_j - o_j| < 1/100$. This implies in particular that the cross-ratio of these four points is close to 1. Hence, the results of the previous section show that there exists a positive $p_0 = p_0(\kappa)$ such that the paths $\underline{\gamma}$ hookup in each of the two possible ways with $\mathbf{P}_{\underline{z}}$ probability at least p_0 for all $\underline{z} \in \mathcal{T}$.

We also denote by $\underline{\nu}$ the measure on quadruples $\underline{z} \in \mathcal{T}$ obtained by sampling independently each z_j uniformly on the part of the unit circle that is at distance less than $1/100$ from o_j . The law $\mathbf{P}_{\underline{\nu}}$ is then obtained by first choosing $\underline{z}$ according to $\underline{\nu}$ and then sampling $\mathbf{P}_{\underline{z}}$.

Let us also introduce some further notation that we will use throughout this section. We denote by $U(r) = U(r, \underline{\gamma})$ the event that all four strands $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_4$ reach the circle of radius r around the origin, and we call $t_j(r)$ their respective hitting times of this circle. On this event $U(r)$, we then define the connected component $D_r = D_r(\underline{\gamma})$ of $\mathbf{D} \setminus \cup_j \gamma_j([0, t_j(r)])$ that contains the origin, and the conformal transformation $\psi_r = \psi_{r, \underline{\gamma}}$ from $D_r(\underline{\gamma})$ back onto $\mathbf{D}$ with $\psi_{r, \underline{\gamma}}(0) = 0$ and $\psi'_{r, \underline{\gamma}}(0) > 0$. We then also consider the image $\underline{z}(r) = \underline{z}(r, \underline{\gamma})$ under $\psi_{r, \underline{\gamma}}$ of the four endpoints $\gamma_j(t_j(r))$. The previous considerations show that conditionally on $U(r)$ and on the four strands up to the hitting times $t_j(r)$, the law of the image $\underline{\gamma}^r$ of the remaining to be discovered parts of the four strands under $\psi_{r, \underline{\gamma}}$ is exactly $\mathbf{P}_{\underline{z}(r, \underline{\gamma})}$.

We can finally recall again that the conditional law of γ_3 given all of γ_1 is that of an SLE_κ process from its initial to its target point in the complement of γ_1 and that the same is true when we switch the roles of γ_1 and γ_3 . These facts show that the paths do various things with positive probability because one can first sample how they are hooked up using Lemma 3.2 and then resample each of the paths given the other path one at a time. We will use this at several stages in the proof.

4.2. A priori four-arm probabilities estimates. The purpose of this subsection is to derive Lemma 4.2, which is a crude lower bound of the probability that the four strands $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_4$ all get close to the origin in a fairly well-separated way. We note that our goal here is to prove in a short way a lemma that will be sufficient for our purpose, and that it is not difficult to derive stronger statements.

When $n \in \mathbf{N}$, we define $\varepsilon_n := 2^{-n}$ (we will use this notation throughout this section) and the event $E_n = U(\varepsilon_n, \underline{\gamma})$ that all four paths $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_4$ reach the circle of radius ε_n around the origin. Let us first point out the following fact:

Lemma 4.1. *There exist $\alpha_0 \in (0, 2)$ and some constant $c_0 > 0$ such that $\mathbf{P}_{\underline{\nu}}[E_n] \geq c_0 \times (\varepsilon_n)^{\alpha_0}$ for all $n \geq 1$.*

Proof. We will use here a known estimate about the set of double points of an SLE curve when $\kappa \in (4, 8)$. This estimate follows for instance from [17, Theorem 1], where the almost sure double point dimension of SLE_{κ} is actually derived, but we note that it would also be possible to derive the weaker statement that we will use here in a fairly elementary way. Indeed, we will just need a rather crude lower-bound of the first moment.

Suppose that the lemma would not hold, and let us then prove that it would imply an estimate that in turn implies that almost surely, the Hausdorff dimension of the set of points that are in a certain fixed neighborhood of the origin and on $\gamma_1 \cap \gamma_3$ is almost surely equal to 0. This leads to a contradiction, because we know that this is not the case, see for instance [17, Theorem 1].

First of all, let us suppose that $|z| < r$, when $r > 0$ is very small, and consider the conformal transformation $\psi_z: \mathbf{D} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}$ with $\psi_z(0) = z$ and $\psi'_z(0) > 0$. We note that $|\psi'|$ converges uniformly to 1 on the closed unit disk when $r \rightarrow 0$. It follows that if $\mathbf{P}_{\underline{\nu}'}$ denotes the same law as $\mathbf{P}_{\underline{\nu}}$ except that the four starting points are now chosen uniformly such that for each j , $|z_j - o_j| < 1/200$ (instead of $1/100$), and if $U(\varepsilon_n, \underline{\gamma}, z)$ denotes the event that all four paths $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_4$ reach the circle of radius $\varepsilon_n/2$ around z , it follows by conformal invariance that when r is fixed and small enough, then for all n and $|z| < r$,

$$\mathbf{P}_{\underline{\nu}'}[U(\varepsilon_n, \underline{\gamma}, z)] \leq 32\mathbf{P}_{\underline{\nu}}[E_n].$$

If we now suppose that the lemma would not hold, then it would imply that for each $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, there exists $n_k \rightarrow \infty$ such that

$$\mathbf{P}_{\underline{\nu}}[E_{n_k}]/\varepsilon_{n_k}^{\alpha} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

Hence,

$$(4.1) \quad \sup_{z: |z| < r} \mathbf{P}_{\underline{\nu}'}[U(\varepsilon_{n_k}, \underline{\gamma}, z)] = o(\varepsilon_{n_k}^{\alpha}) \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

Note that (4.1) implies an upper bound on the expectation of the area of the set of points in the disk of radius r around the origin that are in the $\varepsilon_{n_k}/2$ -neighborhood of both γ_1 and γ_3 , and one can conclude that, under the probability measure $\mathbf{P}_{\underline{\nu}'}$, the Hausdorff dimension of $\gamma_1 \cap \gamma_3 \cap \{z : |z| < r\}$ is at most $2 - \alpha$. As this is true for all $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, we conclude that this Hausdorff dimension is almost surely equal to 0, and as we have already explained, this is not the case. $\square$

For each $\delta > 0$, we then define the event $F_{n,\delta} \subset E_n$ that $\min_{i \neq j} |z_i(\varepsilon_n, \underline{\gamma}) - z_j(\varepsilon_n, \underline{\gamma})| \geq \delta$. In other words, the event $F_{n,\delta}$ says that in terms of harmonic distance from the origin, the four points of $\underline{z}(\varepsilon_n, \underline{\gamma})$ are δ -separated in $D_{\varepsilon_n}(\underline{\gamma})$.

Lemma 4.2. *There exists $\delta_0 > 0$ so that for infinitely many values of n , $\mathbf{P}_{\underline{\nu}}[F_{n,\delta_0}] \geq c_0(\varepsilon_n)^{\alpha_0}/8$.*

Proof. Let us first note that, if we choose $\delta_0 > 0$ small enough, then for all n , $\mathbf{P}_\nu[E_{n+1} | (E_n \setminus F_{n,\delta_0})] \leq 1/8$. Indeed, when $E_n \setminus F_{n,\delta_0}$ holds, then at least two of the strands of γ corresponding to very close points $z_j(t_j(\varepsilon_n))$ will be very likely to hook up without reaching the circle of radius ε_{n+1} .

Suppose now that for such a choice of δ_0 , and for all n greater than some n_0 , $\mathbf{P}_\nu[F_{n,\delta_0}] \leq \mathbf{P}_\nu[E_n]/8$. Then, we would get that for all $n > n_0$,

$$\mathbf{P}_\nu[E_{n+1}] \leq \mathbf{P}_\nu[F_{n,\delta_0}] + \mathbf{P}_\nu[E_n \setminus F_{n,\delta_0}]/8 \leq \mathbf{P}_\nu[E_n]/4$$

which would imply that $\mathbf{P}_\nu[E_n]$ is bounded by a constant times $4^{-n} = (2^{-n})^2$. But we know from the previous estimate that this is not the case, and we can therefore conclude that $\mathbf{P}_\nu[F_{n,\delta_0}] \geq \mathbf{P}_\nu[E_n]/8$ for infinitely many values of n . $\square$

From now on, δ will be fixed and equal to such a $\delta_0 > 0$, and we will just write F_n instead of F_{n,δ_0} .

We are now going to define a new event E'_n by “composition” of F_n with another event, which is an idea that we will repeatedly use. Let us first define the event G that four strands $\underline{\gamma}$ reach the circle of radius $1/2$, that $\underline{z}(1/2, \underline{\gamma}) \in \mathcal{T}$ and that $D_{1/2}(\underline{\gamma})$ is a subset of the disk of radius $3/4$ around the origin.

We now say that the event E'_n holds if F_n holds, and if $\underline{\gamma}^{\varepsilon_n}$ satisfies G . Then, we can note that there exists a constant $c_1 > 0$, so that for infinitely any values of n , $\mathbf{P}_\nu[E'_n] \geq c_1 \times (\varepsilon_n)^{\alpha_0}$. Indeed, because of Lemma 4.2, it suffices to see that $\mathbf{P}_\nu[G]$ is bounded from below uniformly for all δ -separated quadruples of starting points, (which in turns implies that $\mathbf{P}_\nu[E'_n | F_n]$ is bounded from below). This fact can then easily be checked using the absolute continuity and resampling arguments mentioned at the end of Section 4.1.

We now explain how to control the dependence of our events with respect to the initial configuration $\underline{z} \in \mathcal{T}$. Let us consider the four strands until they reach the circle of radius $1/2$ around the unit circle. We now want to argue that there exists a constant $c_2 > 0$, such that for each configuration of starting points $\underline{z} \in \mathcal{T}$, one can find an event $G_1 = G_1(\underline{z})$ (possibly extending the probability space in order to use extra randomness) with $\mathbf{P}_\nu[G_1] = c_2$, and such that $G_1 \subset \{\underline{z}(1/2, \underline{\gamma}) \in \mathcal{T}\}$ and, conditionally on $G_1(\underline{z})$, the law of $\underline{z}(1/2, \underline{\gamma})$ is that of four independent uniformly chosen points in the $1/100$ neighborhoods of the o_j 's in the unit circle. This fact can be easily worked out, for instance using the resampling property of the law of the four strands.

We now define the event $E''_n = E''_n(\underline{z})$ to hold if $G_1(\underline{z})$ holds and if $\underline{\gamma}^{1/2}$ satisfies E'_n . For a general configuration of four strands γ , we will just say that E''_n holds if $E_n(\gamma_1(0), \dots, \gamma_4(0))$ holds. In this way, we can notice that $\mathbf{P}_\nu[E''_n]$ does in fact not depend on the choice of $\underline{z} \in \mathcal{T}$. It does however depend on n . We have just seen that for infinitely many values of n ,

$$\mathbf{P}_\nu[E''_n] \geq c_1 c_2 \times (\varepsilon_n)^{\alpha_0}.$$

This shows in particular that there exist infinitely many values of n so that

$$(4.2) \quad \mathbf{P}_\nu[E''_n] > (10^4 \varepsilon_n)^{(\alpha_0+2)/2}.$$

We now choose a value of $N \geq 10$ so that (4.2) holds. We will keep this N fixed until the end of this section. We define also b , β_0 and β so that

$$b := \mathbf{P}_\nu[E''_N] = (\varepsilon_N)^{\beta_0} = (100 \varepsilon_N)^\beta$$

and note that $0 < \beta_0 < \beta < 2$.

We can also note that on the event E''_N , it is natural to define the domain D''_N corresponding to the complementary connected component containing the origin of the four strands up to the respective

times at which one sees that E''_N is satisfied. Note that the conformal radius (from the origin) of D''_N is in the interval $[4\varepsilon_N, \varepsilon_N/4]$ (this follows from multiplicativity of the conformal radii, Koebe's 1/4 Theorem and from the definitions of E'_N and G_1). When mapping D''_N back to the unit disk, the remaining to be discovered strands are exactly $((\gamma^{1/2})^{\varepsilon_N})^{1/2}$, that we denote by $e(\gamma)$.

Finally, and this will be important for what follows, we can note that our definition of G_1 ensures that for any bounded function f we have that $\mathbf{E}_{\underline{z}}[1_{E''_N} f(e(\gamma))]$ does not depend on $\underline{z} \in \mathcal{T}$.

4.3. The good pivotal regions and their number. We are now going to use the previous considerations to define further events E^k for $k \geq 1$. The event E^1 is just the event E''_N with N chosen as before. Then, we define E^2 to be the event that E^1 holds and that $e(\gamma)$ also satisfies the event E''_N . As on the event E''_N , the configuration of the images of the end-points is in $\mathcal{T}$, it follows that for all $\underline{z} \in \mathcal{T}$ we have that $\mathbf{P}_{\underline{z}}[E^2] = \mathbf{P}_{\underline{o}}[E^1]^2 = b^2$. We then iteratively define the decreasing family of events E^k in an analogous manner for $k \geq 3$. More precisely, E^k is the event that E^1 holds, and that $e(\gamma)$ satisfies the event E^{k-1} . Then, the very same argument shows that for all $\underline{z} \in \mathcal{T}$,

$$\mathbf{P}_{\underline{z}}[E^k] = \mathbf{P}_{\underline{o}}[E^k] = \mathbf{P}_{\underline{o}}[E^1]^k = b^k = (100\varepsilon_N)^{k\beta} = (\varepsilon_N)^{k\beta_0}$$

where $0 < \beta_0 < \beta < 2$.

Let us now make some comments of the shape of the connected component D^k containing the origin of the complement of the four strands up to the stopping times corresponding to the event E^k (for instance, $D^1 = D''_N$). Let us denote by ρ_k the conformal radius of D^k as viewed from the origin. It follows from our definitions of the event E''_N together with Koebe's 1/4 Theorem that:

- For all k , $\varepsilon_N/4 \leq \rho_{k+1}/\rho_k \leq 4\varepsilon_N$. This implies in particular that $\rho_k \leq (4\varepsilon_N)^k$.
- The boundary of D^k is included in the annulus between the circles of radii $\rho_k/4$ (this is just Koebe's 1/4 Theorem) and $10\rho_k$ around the origin (this last fact follows from the last event in the definition of G).

Suppose now that u is a point in the unit disk. We define the Möbius transformation $\psi_u: \mathbf{D} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}$ with $\psi_u(u) = 0$ and $\psi'_u(u) > 0$. For a given configuration defined under $\mathbf{P}_{\underline{z}}$, we say that the event $E^k(u)$ holds if the image of the configuration under ψ_u satisfies E^k .

We define $\mathcal{T}' \subset \mathcal{T}$ to be the collection all 4-tuples $\underline{z}$ where for each j , $|z_j - o_j| < 1/200$. We can note that one can then find r_0 , so that for all u with $|u| < r_0$, $\psi_u(\underline{z}) \in \mathcal{T}$ as soon as $\underline{z} \in \mathcal{T}'$. Hence, for $|u| < r_0$ and all $\underline{z} \in \mathcal{T}'$, $\mathbf{P}_{\underline{z}}[E^k(u)] = \mathbf{P}_{\psi_u(\underline{z})}[E^k] = b^k$.

Our next goal is now to derive the following second moment bound:

Lemma 4.3. *There exists a constant $C' > 0$ so that for all $\underline{z} \in \mathcal{T}'$, for all k and all $u, v \in B(0, r_0)$ with $|u - v| \geq 2^{-Nk}$, we have*

$$\mathbf{P}_{\underline{z}}[E^k(u) \cap E^k(v)] \leq \frac{C' \times b^{2k}}{|u - v|^\beta}.$$

Proof. Let us define $D^k(u)$ and $D^k(v)$ just as before, except that they correspond to the domain around u and v respectively (so that $\psi_u(D^k(u))$ has the same law as D^k , for instance). Let $K(u, v)$ denote the smallest k such that $D^k(u)$ does not contain the disk of radius $16(\varepsilon_N)^{-1}|u - v|$ around u , and $K(v, u)$ similarly (interchanging u and v). By symmetry, it is sufficient to bound the probability of the event $E^k(u) \cap E^k(v) \cap \{K(u, v) \leq K(v, u)\}$. We are going to decompose this according to the value of $K(u, v)$.

Note that by our previous bounds on the conformal radius of D^k ,

$$|u - v|/(4\varepsilon_N) \leq \rho_{K(u,v)} \leq (4\varepsilon_N)^{K(u,v)}$$

so that $(4\varepsilon_N)^{K(u,v)} \geq |u - v|$. We can therefore restrict ourselves to the values k_0 taken by $K(u, v)$, so that

$$b^{k_0} = (100\varepsilon_N)^{k_0\beta} \geq |u - v|^\beta.$$

Suppose that $k_0 = K(u, v) \leq K(v, u)$ and let us consider the four strands $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_4$ up to the time at which the event $E^{k_0+10}(u)$ is realized. Observing these four strands, we are only missing the pieces in $D^{k_0+10}(u)$, so that can already see what happened near v . In particular, we can see – modulo whether the paths $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_4$ hook up in the right way near u – if $E^k(v)$ can hold or not. Furthermore, the conditional probability of the four paths making it so that $E^k(u)$ holds is bounded by a constant times $b^{k-(k_0+10)}$. From this, we can deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{P}_{\underline{z}}[E^k(u) \cap E^k(v) \cap \{k_0 = K(u, v) \leq K(v, u)\}] \\ & \leq b^{k-k_0-10} \mathbf{P}[E^k(v) \cap \{k_0 = K(u, v) \leq K(v, u)\}] \\ & \leq b^{-10} b^k |u - v|^{-\beta} \mathbf{P}[E^k(v) \cap \{k_0 = K(u, v)\}]. \end{aligned}$$

Summing over all possible values of k_0 , and using the symmetry in u and v , we finally get that

$$\mathbf{P}[E^k(u) \cap E^k(v)] \leq 2b^{-10} b^{2k} |u - v|^{-\beta}.$$

□

Let $\mathcal{N}_k = B(0, r_0) \cap (2^{-kN} \mathbf{Z}^2)$. Let us now define the number N_k of points in $\mathcal{N}_k$ such that $E_k(u)$ holds. Our previous moment bounds imply some control on the law of N_k as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Recall that β_0 is the value chosen so that $b = 2^{-N\beta_0}$.

Lemma 4.4. *There exist a constant $a > 0$ such that for all $\underline{z} \in \mathcal{T}'$ and all $k \geq 1$, we have that*

$$\mathbf{P}_{\underline{z}}[a \leq N_k/2^{kN(2-\beta_0)} \leq 1/a] \geq a.$$

Proof. Let $X = X_k$ denote the random variable $N_k/2^{kN(2-\beta_0)}$. As $\mathbf{P}_{\underline{z}}[E^k(u)] = b^k$, we have that

$$\mathbf{E}_{\underline{z}}[X_k] = 2^{-2kN} 2^{\beta_0 kN} \sum_{u \in \mathcal{N}_k} \mathbf{P}_{\underline{z}}[E^k(u)] = 2^{-2kN} \#\mathcal{N}_k$$

which is bounded from above and from below by positive constants that are independent of k and of $\underline{z} \in \mathcal{T}'$.

On the other hand,

$$\mathbf{E}_{\underline{z}}[(X_k)^2] = (2^{-2kN} 2^{\beta_0 kN})^2 \sum_{u, v \in \mathcal{N}_k} \mathbf{P}_{\underline{z}}[E^k(u) \cap E^k(v)].$$

The sum when $u = v$ is again easily taken care of by the fact that $\mathbf{P}_{\underline{z}}[E^k(u)] = b^k$, and Lemma 4.3 takes care of all the terms in the sum for $u \neq v$; we get that for some constant C , for all $\underline{z} \in \mathcal{T}'$ and all k ,

$$\mathbf{E}_{\underline{z}}[(X_k)^2] \leq C + C(2^{-2kN})^2 \sum_{v \neq u \in \mathcal{N}_k} |u - v|^{-\beta}$$

which is easily shown to be bounded by some explicit constant independent of k because $\beta \in (0, 2)$.

This information on the first and second moments of X_k then classically imply the lemma. □

4.4. Rerandomizing configurations in pivotal regions and conclusion of the proof. We now complete the proof of Theorem 1.2. We begin by establishing the following intermediate result.

Lemma 4.5. *Let γ be the branch of the CLE_κ exploration tree from $-i$ to i in $\mathbf{D}$. The probability that the conditional law of γ given the CLE_κ gasket is not supported on a single path is strictly positive.*

Proof. Let $\underline{\gamma}$ be the four strands defined under the law $\mathbf{P}_{\underline{\gamma}}$. We also let Γ be the corresponding loop ensemble and Υ its gasket. We will show that, with positive probability, the conditional probability that γ_1 terminates at z_4 given Υ is in $(0, 1)$.

For each given k , consider the Markov chain on $(\Gamma, \underline{\gamma})$ configurations defined as follows:

- Pick a point $u \in \mathcal{N}_k^\beta$ uniformly at random,
- Check whether the event $E^k(u)$ occurs, and
- If so, resample the terminal segments of the paths in $D^k(u)$ and the rest of the CLE_κ in $D^k(u)$.

Note that this chain preserves the joint law of $(\Gamma, \underline{\gamma})$. This law is also preserved if we run the chain exactly $2^{kN(2-\beta_0)}$ steps.

We now want to use Lemma 4.4 to see that if we run the chain for $2^{kN(2-\beta_0)}$ steps there is a positive chance (bounded from below uniformly w.r.t. k) such that there exists exactly one single time during these steps at which the chain discovers a point $u \in \mathcal{N}_k$ where $E^k(u)$ occurs and switches the connections near this point.

To see this, we first notice that if we sample $2^{kN(2-\beta_0)}$ times a uniformly chosen point in $\mathcal{N}_k$ for a given configuration Γ , then with a probability bounded uniformly from below (say, larger than some a_0), one hits exactly one point u for which $E^k(u)$ holds and switches it. Then, we need to argue that once this point has been switched and we get a new configuration $\tilde{\Gamma}$, with positive probability, if we sample the remaining uniformly chosen points in $\mathcal{N}_k$ (so that we have sampled a total of $2^{kN(2-\beta_0)}$ such points), then we do not find a point u for which the event $E^k(u)$ occurs for the new configuration.

To justify this, we note that the proof of Lemma 4.3 (in particular, the fact that we derived an upper bound on the conditional probability of $E^k(v)$ occurring given $E^k(u)$, regardless of how the paths hook up near u), we get that for every $u \in \mathcal{N}_k$, conditionally on the event that u has been picked among the $2^{kN(2-\beta_0)}$ times and on the fact that $E^k(u)$ did hold at that time, the mean number of points $v \in \mathcal{N}_k$ such that $E^k(v)$ holds either before or after the switch near u is bounded by a constant times $b^k \times \#\mathcal{N}_k$. In particular, the conditional probability that this number of points is greater than some explicit large but fixed constant times $b^k \times \#\mathcal{N}_k$ is as small as we want (provided the constant is chosen large enough). And if this number of points is smaller than this constant times $b^k \times \#\mathcal{N}_k$, then the conditional probability that no further changes are made to the configuration during the remaining switching attempts is bounded uniformly from below.

Then, if $\tilde{\Gamma}$ denotes the resulting loop ensemble and $\tilde{\Upsilon}$ its gasket, the Hausdorff distance between Υ and $\tilde{\Upsilon}$ is at most $(8\varepsilon_N)^k$, while $\tilde{\Gamma}$ has changed more dramatically (now γ_1 hooks up with the other strand). Therefore sending $k \rightarrow \infty$ (and possibly passing to an appropriate subsequence), we get an asymptotic coupling which satisfies the desired property. $\square$

We are now conclude the proof of Theorem 1.2 via a zero-one law type argument.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Let η be the branch of the CLE_κ exploration tree from $-i$ to i in the unit disk. By Lemma 4.5, we know that η is not determined by the gasket Υ of Γ with probability at least $p \in (0, 1]$. We can parameterize η as seen from i . Since $\eta(t)$ converges almost surely to i as $t \rightarrow \infty$, it is clear that for some given large t_0 , the probability $p(t_0)$ that η up to time t_0 is not determined by Υ is strictly positive. By scaling and conformal invariance, this probability $p(t_0)$ is independent of t_0 .

For a given fixed t_0 , as explained in the CLE_κ description, it is possible to discover simultaneously η up to time t_0 and the CLE_κ loops it traces. In particular, we can trace η up to the first time at which it will touch the boundary of the disk again, and leave the loop that it was tracing at time t_0 in order to branch towards i . At that time, the conditional law of the CLE in the remaining to be explored domain with i on its boundary is just the law of a CLE in this domain. It can in particular be resampled without affecting η up to time t_0 . Hence, after that time, the conditional probability that future of η is not determined by the gasket is still p , independently of η up to time t_0 . Hence, we get that $1 - p \leq (1 - p)(1 - p(t_0))$. As $p > 0$, we conclude that $p = 1$. $\square$

Note that this argument in fact can be adapted to see that the conditional law of η given Υ is almost surely non-atomic.

5. DERIVATION OF THEOREM 1.1 AND OF THEOREM 1.3

We now explain how to adapt the previous ideas in order to derive the other two theorems stated in the introduction.

5.1. Randomness of continuum percolation interfaces. We first give the proof of Theorem 1.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. As mentioned in the introduction, our proof for CPIs in the case where $p = 1$ (i.e. where all of the CLE loops have the same label) can in fact be easily adapted to the more general setting of labeled CLE carpets. So, for simplicity, we will only include the argument in the case that $p = 1$.

Fix $\kappa \in (8/3, 4)$ and let $\kappa' = 16/\kappa \in (4, 6)$. We suppose that we have a coupling of a $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$ process Γ' and a CLE_κ process Γ as described at the end of Section 2.3. Just as in Section 3.1, we then explore part of the branch of the $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$ exploration tree from $-i$ to i , and then, starting from its most recent intersection with $\partial\mathbf{D}$ in the counterclockwise direction starting from $-i$, we start drawing the currently explored loop backwards up to some stopping time. We then condition on all of the CLE_κ loops which intersect the part of the $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$ exploration tree that we have observed so far. See the left side of Figure 7 for an illustration. By [15, Theorem 7.3], we know in particular that the conditional law of the $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$ exploration tree in the connected component of the remaining domain which has i on its boundary, is given by that of an independent $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$ exploration tree in the remaining domain. (In the FK-Potts analogy in a domain D , one considers a monochromatic with color “A” boundary condition for Potts that one can view as a wired boundary condition for the coupled FK model, and one explores the inner boundaries that touch ∂D of the open FK-cluster up to some time – this corresponds to the exploration of the CLE'_κ tree. Then, one attaches to its right all the clusters of “non-A” sites which therefore have A’s on their outer boundary, and notes that in the remaining domain, one has again A-monochromatic boundary conditions).

This allows us to set things up in a manner which is similar to the proof of Theorem 1.2 except we will choose the point from which we start to explore another part of the $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$ exploration tree

differently. Namely, we pick a point which is on one of the aforementioned CLE_κ loops and then explore a branch of the $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$ exploration tree from there and then part of the time-reversal of the branch targeted at its most recent intersection with the domain boundary on its right side, as illustrated in the right side of Figure 7.




FIGURE 7. **Left:** The branch of the $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$ exploration tree from $-i$ to i drawn up to a given time (red), as well as the time-reversal of the path targeted at the most recent intersection with the counterclockwise segment of $\partial\mathbf{D}$ from $-i$ to i (blue), just like in Section 3.1. We take the $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$ to be coupled with a CLE_κ as a percolation in the CLE_κ carpet; the filled loops are the CLE_κ loops which intersect the part of the $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$ we have explored so far. The conditional law of the CLE_κ in the unexplored region is then independently a CLE_κ in each of the components. **Right:** Shown is a partial exploration of a loop which is attached to the green CLE_κ loops. If the two new branches hook up with the previous two, then they all correspond to the same outermost $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$ loop and if they do not, then the first ones correspond to an outermost loop and the other ones to another loop, surrounded by the first loop.

Then we have four marked boundary points and we can proceed in this setting with the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 1.2. In particular, the argument of Theorem 1.2 implies that if the inner/outer paths create special intersection points, then we cannot tell if the inner paths hook up with each other and the outer paths with each other or if the inner and outer paths hookup. Note that the actual gasket of the $\text{CLE}_{\kappa'}$ is then not the same depending on the way in which the paths hookup (which is a stronger statement than just saying that the exploration path is not the same).

This implies that the percolation exploration of the CLE_κ is with positive probability not determined by the CLE_κ carpet. A simple zero-one argument (by looking at smaller and smaller pieces of the CPI) then implies that it is in fact the case that the percolation exploration is almost surely not determined by the CLE_κ carpet and in fact the conditional law is almost surely non-atomic. $\square$

5.2. Randomness of the SLE curve given its range. We now turn to Theorem 1.1. In the present section, we again assume that $\kappa \in (4, 8)$. Let us first note the following fact, that allows us to consider an $\text{SLE}_\kappa(\kappa - 6)$ instead of an SLE_κ .

Lemma 5.1. *The probability that the conditional law of an SLE_κ process given its entire range is non-trivial is either equal to 0 or to 1, and it is equal to the corresponding probability for an $\text{SLE}_\kappa(\kappa - 6)$ process.*

Proof. By [12, Proposition 7.30] the conditional law of an $\text{SLE}_\kappa(\kappa - 6)$ process given its left and right boundaries is independently that of an $\text{SLE}_\kappa(\kappa/2 - 4; \kappa/2 - 4)$ in each of the bubbles formed by the left and right boundaries. Note that there are almost surely infinitely many such bubbles, because there are infinitely many global cut points on an $\text{SLE}_\kappa(\kappa - 6)$ (this follows from the fact that the same is true for an SLE_κ , see [17] and the references therein). Note that these left and right boundaries *are* determined by the range of the path. Therefore, the probability that an $\text{SLE}_\kappa(\kappa - 6)$ process is determined by its range is equal to 1 if the same is true for an $\text{SLE}_\kappa(\kappa/2 - 4; \kappa/2 - 4)$, and it is equal to 0 otherwise. The very same argument also applies to SLE_κ (conditionally on its left and right boundaries, it also consists of independent $\text{SLE}_\kappa(\kappa/2 - 4; \kappa/2 - 4)$ in each of the infinitely many bubbles), which implies the lemma statement. $\square$

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. By the previous lemma, we can consider the case where η is an $\text{SLE}_\kappa(\kappa - 6)$ process in $\mathbf{D}$ from $-i$ to i which is given as the branch of a CLE_κ exploration tree in $\mathbf{D}$.

As explained in the introduction, and in contrast to the proof of Theorem 1.2, we will need to resample the configuration in *two* different well-chosen regions rather than just at *one*, in order to globally preserve the range of η .

We suppose that r is chosen to be very small, and we let B_1 and B_2 be the open disks of radii r around $-1/2$ and around $1/2$ respectively. As in the proof of Theorem 1.2, we can control the number N_k^1 of good approximate pivotals in B_1 (resp. the number N_k^2 of good approximate pivotals in B_2) instead of the number N_k of approximate pivotals in the ball of radius r_0 around the origin. The argument of the proof of Theorem 1.2 allows to control separately N_k^1 and N_k^2 . Let us now explain how one can in fact control *both* simultaneously, i.e. that there exist a positive constant a such that for all $z \in \mathcal{T}'$ and all $k \geq 1$,

$$(5.1) \quad \mathbf{P}_z[a2^{kN(2-\beta_0)} \leq \min(N_k^1, N_k^2) \leq \max(N_k^1, N_k^2) \leq 2^{kN(2-\beta_0)}/a] \geq a.$$

One way to proceed is to notice that the probability of the event A that η visits B_1 , then B_2 , then B_1 , then B_2 in that order, and hits the boundary of the unit disk and itself inbetween (so that the branches disconnect B_1 from B_2) as depicted in Figure 8-(i) is strictly positive. We can furthermore impose on A the fact that the cross-ratios of the four landing points on B_1 and on B_2 as indicated on the right of Figure 8-(ii) in the complement of the paths drawn there are in $[u, 1/u]$ for some positive constant u .

The arguments in Section 3.1 show that when A holds, then conditionally on the four strands up to when they hit B_1 as in Figure 8-(iii), the hook-up probabilities are bounded away from 0 and from 1 (this is because these four strands near B_1 do correspond exactly to an exploration as in Section 3.1, except that it is started from -1 and i instead of from $-i$ and i). If this resampling has changed the hook-up configuration near B_1 , one can apply the same argument near B_2 , noting that the four strands near B_2 do correspond to the “exploration” of the CLE starting from -1 and i , as in the fourth picture. This shows that on the event A' that there exists strands like on Figure 8-(i), the joint conditional law of the configuration near B_1 and of the configuration near B_2 is absolutely continuous with respect to that of two conditionally independent samples, where the




FIGURE 8. From top left to bottom right: (i) The event A . (ii) The same picture without the parts near B_1 and B_2 . (iii) Before resampling near B_1 . (iv) Before resampling near B_2

Radon-Nikodym derivative is uniformly bounded and bounded away from 0, which in turn allows to deduce (5.1).

Then, as in the proof of Theorem 1.2, with positive probability, if we perform the Markov step where we pick $2^{kN\beta_0}$ points uniformly in $2^{-kN}\mathbf{Z}^2 \cap B_1$ and in $2^{-kN}\mathbf{Z}^2 \cap B_2$, then we will have a positive chance (bounded from below) of hitting just one pivotal in B_1 and just one pivotal in B_2 . On this event, if one flips the configurations near both of these two points, the exploration tree path in the new CLE_κ will have Hausdorff distance at most $e^{-(\beta-c)k}$ from the original exploration tree path but visit its range in a different order.

Taking a (possibly subsequential) limit as $k \rightarrow \infty$ thus yields an asymptotic coupling of two $\text{SLE}_\kappa(\kappa - 6)$ processes which with positive probability have the same range but visit points in a different order. Hence, the probability that an $\text{SLE}_\kappa(\kappa - 6)$ process is not determined by its range is strictly positive, which concludes the proof, by Lemma 5.1. $\square$

6. COMMENTS

6.1. Relationship with the SLE/GFF coupling. SLE_κ and CLE_κ can be naturally coupled with an instance h of the Gaussian free field (GFF) on a simply connected domain $D \subseteq \mathbf{C}$ with appropriately chosen boundary data (see e.g. [20, 23, 4, 12, 11, 15]). Theorem 1.1 has some consequences for the coupling of SLE_κ for $\kappa \in (4, 8)$ with the GFF, Theorem 1.2 for the coupling of CLE_κ for $\kappa \in (4, 8)$, and Theorem 1.3 for CLE_κ for $\kappa \in (8/3, 4)$.

Let us first comment on the SLE_κ /GFF coupling for $\kappa \in (4, 8)$. Suppose that h is a GFF on a simply connected domain $D \subseteq \mathbf{C}$ with boundary data so that it may be coupled with an SLE_κ process η from one point on ∂D to another. In this coupling, the boundary data for the conditional law of h given η is in each component U of $D \setminus \eta$ given by a constant plus a multiple of the argument of the derivative of the uniformizing conformal map $\varphi: U \rightarrow \mathbf{H}$. Although the winding of ∂U is not defined in the usual sense as it is fractal, $\arg \varphi'$ has the interpretation of being the *harmonic extension* of the winding of ∂U from ∂U to U . In particular, there is a marked point on ∂U where $\arg \varphi'$ makes a jump of size 2π . In terms of the path, this point corresponds to the first (equivalently last) point on ∂U visited by η . If one observes only the range of η in addition to the GFF boundary data then it is in fact possible to recover the trajectory of η in a measurable way. This follows because η turns out to be a deterministic function of h [4, 12] and the values of h in the components of $D \setminus \eta$ are conditionally independent of η itself given the values of h along η . Theorem 1.1 therefore implies that one cannot recover the marked points or GFF field heights by observing the range of η and the orientations of the loops that it makes alone.

The case of CLE_κ for $\kappa \in (8/3, 8) \setminus \{4\}$ is similar to that of SLE_κ . The reason for this is that one couples CLE_κ for $\kappa \in (4, 8)$ with the GFF by coupling the whole exploration tree of $SLE_\kappa(\kappa - 6)$ processes with the GFF [12, 11, 15]. The case that $\kappa = 4$ is different because in this case the conditional law of the GFF given the loops is given by a constant which is determined by the loop orientations. In particular, the loops are not marked by a special point so that there is no additional randomness involved here.

The Markov step used to prove Theorems 1.1–1.3 is also interesting to think about in the context of the GFF: While this operation only affects the small regions of the CLE picture, it does have a less localized influence for the corresponding GFF. This is because changing the manner in which the loops of a CLE are hooked up has the effect of moving the marked point along the component boundaries which in turn translates into changing the GFF heights along the loop boundaries. That is, our Markov step is a measure preserving transformation defined on GFF instances which leaves the CLE gasket fixed but makes a macroscopic change to the corresponding GFF instance because the heights are changed.

6.2. Quantum gravity perspective. It is natural to wonder whether techniques involving quantum gravity and mating of trees, as described e.g. in [5], could be used to give an alternate proof of Theorems 1.1–1.3. In this short subsection, we make some brief and informal remarks about how the operations described in this paper could potentially be understood and studied within that framework. The re-randomization procedure that we have described here also naturally fits into the quantum gravity framework developed in [5]. In particular, it is implicit in the constructions of [5] that there is a quantum version of the “natural” measure on SLE_κ double points and intersections of CLE_κ loops. It is not difficult to see that if one picks a typical such point using this measure in either setting and then “zooms in,” the resulting limit is the same if one starts in either the SLE_κ double point or CLE_κ loop intersection settings. In fact, it can be described as a gluing of eight

so-called quantum wedges which correspond to the four strands of path and the four regions which separate the path strands. The operation of resampling how the paths are hooked up has a natural interpretation in the quantum gravity perspective. Indeed, it is shown in [5] that an SLE_κ path or CLE_κ path for $\kappa \in (4, 8)$ can be represented as a gluing of a pair of looptrees which arise from a pair of independent $(\kappa/4)$ -stable Lévy processes; see [5, Figure 1.6 and Figure 1.7]. These looptrees correspond to the components which are cut off on the left and right sides of the path. Regluing the paths in order to switch the direction of a pivotal point corresponds to natural operations that one can preform directly on the trees (hence Lévy processes) themselves, namely cutting the pair of trees to form new trees or grafting trees together.

Acknowledgements. JM and WW respectively thank the FIM at ETH Zürich and the Statslab of the University of Cambridge for their hospitality on several occasions during which part of the work for this project was completed. JM also thanks Institut Henri Poincaré for support as a holder of the Poincaré chair, during which this work was completed. JM's, SS's and WW's work were respectively partially supported by the NSF grant DMS-1204894, the NSF grant DMS-1209044 and the SNF grant 155922. WW is part of the NCCR Swissmap.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Benoist and C. Hongler. The scaling limit of critical Ising interfaces is $\text{CLE}(3)$. *ArXiv e-prints*, Apr. 2016.
- [2] F. Camia and C. M. Newman. Two-dimensional critical percolation: the full scaling limit. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 268(1):1–38, 2006.
- [3] J. Dubédat. Commutation relations for Schramm-Loewner evolutions. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 60(12):1792–1847, 2007.
- [4] J. Dubédat. SLE and the free field: partition functions and couplings. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 22(4):995–1054, 2009.
- [5] B. Duplantier, J. Miller, and S. Sheffield. Liouville quantum gravity as a mating of trees. *ArXiv e-prints*, Sept. 2014.
- [6] C. Garban, G. Pete, and O. Schramm. The Fourier spectrum of critical percolation. *Acta Math.*, 205(1):19–104, 2010.
- [7] C. Garban, G. Pete, and O. Schramm. Pivotal, cluster, and interface measures for critical planar percolation. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 26(4):939–1024, 2013.
- [8] G. Grimmett. *The random-cluster model*, volume 333 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2006.
- [9] G. Lawler, O. Schramm, and W. Werner. Conformal restriction: the chordal case. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 16(4):917–955 (electronic), 2003.
- [10] G. F. Lawler. *Conformally invariant processes in the plane*, volume 114 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2005.
- [11] J. Miller and S. Sheffield. Imaginary geometry IV: interior rays, whole-plane reversibility, and space-filling trees. *ArXiv e-prints*, Feb. 2013. To appear in *Probab. Theory Related Fields*.
- [12] J. Miller and S. Sheffield. Imaginary geometry I: interacting SLEs. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 164(3-4):553–705, 2016.
- [13] J. Miller and S. Sheffield. Imaginary geometry II: reversibility of $\text{SLE}_\kappa(\rho_1; \rho_2)$ for $\kappa \in (0, 4)$. *Ann. Probab.*, 44(3):1647–1722, 2016.
- [14] J. Miller and S. Sheffield. Imaginary geometry III: reversibility of SLE_κ for $\kappa \in (4, 8)$. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 184:455–486, 2016.
- [15] J. Miller, S. Sheffield, and W. Werner. CLE percolations. *ArXiv e-prints*, Feb. 2016.
- [16] J. Miller and W. Werner. Connection probabilities for conformal loop ensembles. *ArXiv e-prints*, Feb. 2017.
- [17] J. Miller and H. Wu. Intersections of SLE Paths: the double and cut point dimension of SLE. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 167(1-2):45–105, 2017.
- [18] S. Rohde and O. Schramm. Basic properties of SLE. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 161(2):883–924, 2005.
- [19] O. Schramm. Scaling limits of loop-erased random walks and uniform spanning trees. *Israel J. Math.*, 118:221–288, 2000.

- [20] O. Schramm and S. Sheffield. A contour line of the continuum Gaussian free field. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 157(1-2):47–80, 2013.
- [21] O. Schramm and D. B. Wilson. SLE coordinate changes. *New York J. Math.*, 11:659–669 (electronic), 2005.
- [22] S. Sheffield. Exploration trees and conformal loop ensembles. *Duke Math. J.*, 147(1):79–129, 2009.
- [23] S. Sheffield. Conformal weldings of random surfaces: SLE and the quantum gravity zipper. *Ann. Probab.*, 44(5):3474–3545, 2016.
- [24] S. Sheffield. Quantum gravity and inventory accumulation. *Ann. Probab.*, 44(6):3804–3848, 2016.
- [25] S. Sheffield and W. Werner. Conformal loop ensembles: the Markovian characterization and the loop-soup construction. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 176(3):1827–1917, 2012.
- [26] S. Smirnov. Critical percolation in the plane: conformal invariance, Cardy’s formula, scaling limits. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.*, 333(3):239–244, 2001.
- [27] S. Smirnov. Conformal invariance in random cluster models. I. Holomorphic fermions in the Ising model. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 172(2):1435–1467, 2010.
- [28] W. Werner. Random planar curves and Schramm-Loewner evolutions. In *Lectures on probability theory and statistics*, volume 1840 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 107–195. Springer, Berlin, 2004.
- [29] W. Werner. Lectures on two-dimensional critical percolation. In *Statistical mechanics*, volume 16 of *IAS/Park City Math. Ser.*, pages 297–360. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2009.

STATSLAB, CENTER FOR MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE, WILBERFORCE ROAD, CAMBRIDGE CB3 0WB, UK

E-mail address: `jpmiller@statslab.cam.ac.uk`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, MIT, 77 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139, USA

E-mail address: `sheffield@math.mit.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, ETH ZÜRICH, RÄMISTR. 101, 8092 ZÜRICH, SWITZERLAND

E-mail address: `wendelin.werner@math.ethz.ch`